

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**IN RE:**

<b>THOMAS W. OLICK,</b>	:	<b>Chapter 13</b>
<b>Debtor(s)</b>	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	<b>Bky. No. 07-10880ELF</b>
<b>THOMAS W. OLICK,</b>	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>JAMES KEARNEY,</b>	:	<b>Adv. No. 07-052ELF</b>
<b>THOMAS JENKINS,</b>	:	
<b>THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS and</b>	:	
<b>AETNA LIFE INSURANCE CO.</b>	:	<b>Adv. No. 07-060ELF</b>
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**O R D E R**

**AND NOW**, the court having entered a final judgment in the above-captioned adversary on December 28, 2009, see Opinion and **Order dated December 28, 2009** (Docket Entry Nos. 393 & 394);

**AND**, Plaintiff Thomas W. Olick (“the Plaintiff”) having filed a Notice of Appeal and a Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis on December 31, 2009, (Docket Entry Nos. 402 & 403);

**AND**, thereafter, the Plaintiff also having filed “Motion to Reconsider the Final Order of 12/28/2009” (“the Motion to Reconsider”) pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9023 on January 4, 2010, (Docket Entry No. 397), which was denied by the court by **Order dated January 20, 2010** (Docket Entry No. 411);

**AND**, on January 22, 2010, apparently before the Plaintiff received a copy of the **Order dated January 20, 2010**, the Plaintiff having filed an “Amended” Motion to Reconsider and Brief in Support thereof, (Docket Entry Nos. 412, 413);

**AND**, following the filing of the “Amended” Motion to Reconsider, the court having reviewed its content as well as the content of the accompanying Brief, having concluded that the “Amended” Motion stated no grounds for reconsidering either the **Order dated December 28, 2009** or the **Order dated January 20, 2010** and having denied the “Amended” Motion to Reconsider by **Order dated January 22, 2010** (Docket Entry No. 416);

**AND**, the **Order dated January 22, 2010** also having **prohibited** the Plaintiff from filing any further motions to reconsider or amended motions to reconsider “in connection with” the **Order dated December 28, 2009**;

**AND**, thereafter the Plaintiff having filed still another motion styled as a “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10” (emphasis added) (Docket Entry No. 420);

**AND**, despite the fact that the latest Motion was filed in violation of the **Order dated January 22, 2010**,<sup>1</sup> the court having reviewed its content;

**AND**, after review of the “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10,” the court concluding that it presents no valid argument for reconsideration of any of the prior Orders;

It is therefore, **ORDERED** that:

1. The “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10” (Docket Entry No. 420) is **DENIED**.
2. The Plaintiff is **PROHIBITED** from filing any further motions to reconsider or amended motions to reconsider in connection with the December 28, 2009 Order or any subsequent Orders entered denying reconsideration.



Date: January 28, 2010

---

**ERIC L. FRANK**  
**U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE**

cc: Thomas W. Olick  
4014 Crestview Avenue  
Easton, PA 18045

---

<sup>1</sup> Because it is likely that the Plaintiff was unaware of the prohibition imposed by the Order dated January 22, 2010, I will not consider imposing sanctions at this time. However, the Plaintiff is now on notice of the prohibition and no further violations this court's Orders will be tolerated. To the extent that the Plaintiff is dissatisfied with the outcome of these adversary proceedings, he should address his complaints to the appellate courts.